

After the motion was carried, Mr. Krishnaswamy Rao said:— "A thorough revision of the Bill has now become necessary. My friend, Mr. Muthunayagam Pillai expressed a wish to have a Bill on the lines of the British Act regulating the procedure on *formal* enquiries into the conduct of the public servants. I think that it will simplify matters if I am permitted to withdraw the mutilated Bill, now before the Council, in order that some other member may introduce a Bill on the lines the Council may decide. I do not pledge to bringing in a Bill in which no provision is made, regarding the preliminary enquiries. I formally move that the Council be pleased to permit the withdrawing of the present Bill."

Mr. Watts seconded this motion.

Mr. Muthunayagam Pillai observed that all the labour hitherto bestowed on the Bill would be lost, if the Bill be withdrawn at this stage.

Mr. Ramanatha Rao said:—

"I would vote for the withdrawal of the Bill as it would simplify matters and not hamper us in introducing a fresh Bill on any basis that may be deemed desirable."

Mr. Bensley said:—

"I am not prepared to vote for the withdrawal of the Bill as I consider it a highly useful and important one. As regards the amendment proposed that it should be referred to a Select Committee with the instruction that the terms of the Bill shall be applicable only to final enquiries, I disapprove of the instruction to be made to the Select Committee in as much as it precludes the issuing of summonses and administering of oaths in preliminary enquiries. As, in my opinion, the object of the Bill as originally set forth was to enable officers conducting departmental enquiries of any sort, to secure the attendance of any person whose testimony they might require and to ensure that some responsibility is attached to any statement they might make, I think the instruction injuriously limits the scope of the Bill."

The Council being equally divided in opinion, Mr. Krishnaswamy Rao's motion was lost by the President's casting vote.

Mr. Ramanatha Rao moved that instead of a Select Committee again sitting on the Bill, the Council resolve itself into a Committee to discuss the provisions of the Bill with the various amendments at the next ordinary meeting on the principles now enunciated.

Mr. Nagam Iyer seconded the motion.

Carried.

PRISONS BILL.

Mr. Watts presented the report of the Select Committee on the Prisons Bill and moved that the same together with the original and the amended Bills be published in the Gazette.

Mr. Thanu Pillay seconded the motion.

Carried.

CIVIL PROCEDURE CODE AMENDMENT BILL.

Mr. Ramanatha Rao said:—

"I rise to move the amendment of which, I have given notice. The words "Service Inam lands" in section 2 of the Civil Procedure Code amendment Bill are too wide and as they stand may include every kind of property which has or ever had some sort of service attached to it. It may not necessarily mean for service which is *being* rendered. The words are liable to be misinterpreted as applying to lands given for services rendered in the past such as "Kudumba Purathi" and "Palansothu-Viruthi" lands. Besides it may also include grants of land for which, perhaps, a nominal service is expected or has to be rendered. If in the section under consideration only Viruthi lands falling under the Royal Proclamation dated ^{10th May 1886} ~~4th Edavom 1901~~ are included, it would much simplify matters and those responsible for the administration of the law will have a very safe guide to go by. I would therefore propose the following explanation to be added to section 2."